UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/595,933	05/19/2006	Bernd Graeve	21334-1586	9187
29450 BARLEY SNY	29450 7590 10/10/2007 BARLEY SNYDER, LLC		EXAMINER	
1000 WESTLA	KES DRIVE, SUITE 2		DUVERNE, JEAN F	
BERWYN, PA 19312			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2839	-
			T	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/10/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

berwynipdocket@barley.com hsalamone@barley.com sanastasi@barley.com

£5	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/595,933	GRAEVE ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Jean F. Duverne	2839			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailine earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. (D. (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 M	May 2006.				
	<i>,</i> —				
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 49	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/19/2006.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

. Application/Control Number: 10/595,933

Art Unit: 2839

٤.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP Patent publication 09238423.

In regard to claims 1, 7-8, JP device discloses a heat-shrinkable shrink tube (see figs. 1-4) for an electrical power cable comprising; a sleeve at 20, 30, or 12 having an electrically insulating inner layer, an electrically conductive outer layer, and between the inner and outer layers a thermoplastic mid-layer at 10 which can be softened by application of heat to the-said sleeve permit dimensional recovery thereof, in that the sleeve being of tubular, one-piece construction and the thermoplastic mid-layers supporting the electrically insulating. The term can as recited in the claims is objected to because it's not a positive limitation. It does not add any patentability to the claims limitations. However, JP device fails to explicitly disclose the size of the different layers. It would have been obvious matter of design choice to have the layers being of certain size, since such modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size for a multiplied effect is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. In re Rose, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

÷

5

In regard to claims 2-6, JP device discloses the aforementioned, but fails to explicitly the material of the layers. It would have obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the layer being made of certain material, since it has being held to be within the general skill of worker in the art in the art to select known a material on the basis of suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. In re Leshin, 125 USPQ 416. It would have been obvious to one have ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the layer made of certain material in order to meet the system specification and requirement.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jean F. Duverne whose telephone number is (571) 272-2091. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-7:30, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TC Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2098. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO

. Application/Control Number: 10/595,933

Art Unit: 2839

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JFD

09/25/2007

Jean Frantz Duverne

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2839